DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 532 CG 010 567

AUTHOR Patchen, Martin; And Others
TITLE Inter-Racial Perceptions Among High School Students.
PUB DATE May 74
NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Aspiration; High School Students; *Integration Effects; Opinions; *Performance Factors; *Race Relations; Racial Attitudes; Racial Factors; Research Projects; *School Integration; Secondary Education

ABSTRACT

This report is concerned with the effects which varying types of interracial experiences have on the academic performance, aspirations, and racial opinions of students. At the same time, it considers the relationships between these outcomes and a variety of factors other than interracial experiences. The study was conducted in all of the public high schools of Indianapolis, Indiana. Data were obtained by questionnaire and from school records on about 2,000 black students and over 2,000 white students. Performance, aspirations, and opinion change for the two races are compared and factors affecting these outcomes are analyzed separately for each race. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123532

INTER-RACIAL PERCEPTIONS AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

by

Martin Patchen and James D. Davidson

Purdue University

and

Gerhard Hofmann

Indiana University at Gary

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Purdue University
May 1974

CG 010 567

ABSTRACT

Six essentially identical factors are found to underlie the perceptions which black students and white students have of their other-race schoolmates. These are: unfriendliness toward one's own race; friendliness toward one's own race; norm-violations; academic orientation; unfriendliness toward the other race; and physical toughness. Black students tend to see white schoolmates as not friendly and as violating norms with respect to acting superior and expecting special privileges. However, Blacks see Whites in a fairly favorable light (compared to Blacks) with respect to unfriendly behavior (toward either race) and with respect to academic orientation. White students tend to see Blacks in a more uniformly negative way (compared to Whites) on most dimensions of perception. Both racial groups see the black students as being more tough physically. Data concerning actual inter-racial behavior, school performance, and aspirations suggest that most perceptions of observable characteristics, but not of goals, have some degree of accuracy.

INTER-RACIAL PERCEPTIONS AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

This paper presents data concerning a) basic factors underlying black and white high school students' perceptions of one another; b) the ways in which members of each racial group see the other race on items reflecting each of these factors; and c) the accuracy of the perceptions which students of each racial group have of their other-race schoolmates. The data were obtained from almost 2,000 black students and over 2,000 white students in the eleven public high schools of Indianapolis, Indiana.

Purposes of Study

There is by now a fairly substantial body of descriptive work concerning the images which Whites have of Blacks (e.g., Bayton, McAlister, and Hamer, 1956; Gilbert, 1951; Karlins, Coffman, and Walters, 1969) and those which Blacks have of Whites (e.g., Brink and Harris, 1966; Cothran, 1951; Johnson, 1957; Works, 1961; Campbell and Schuman, 1968). However, there has been little effort to go beyond study of the acceptance of specific racial descriptions to a consideration of the basic dimensions underlying inter-racial perceptions.[1]

There has been some rigorous empirical investigation of the basic dimensions underlying interpersonal perceptions generally. Factor analyses of ratings of other persons, using the Cattell personality scales, have yielded a recurrent five-factor structure

(Passini and Norman, 1966). These factors are: extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and culture--e.g., polished, refined versus crude, boorish (Tupes and Christal, 1958; Norman, 1963). The best known and probably most extensive empirical work concerning the dimensions of perception is the work of Charles Osgood and his associates (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957; Osgood. 1971). In a series of studies using factor analysis, Osgood and his associates have found the most important dimensions of "meaning" (relevant to person concepts as well as other concepts) to be 1) evaluative (good-bad); 2) potency (strong-weak); and 3) activity (active-passive).[2] Work by Todd and Rappoport (1964) indicates that the dimensions of cognitive structure which are found in a given study may depend on the particular method which is used. These researchers found that the perceptual dimensions yielded by the Hays implication model, as well as dimensions yielded by simply asking subjects to group traits, differed from the dimensions yielded by Osgood's semantic differential method.

The body of work on interpersonal perception as a general process has potential relevance for the study of intergroup perceptions. However, only a very limited amount of work concerning the dimensions of intergroup perceptions has been done. Ehrlich and Van Tubergen (1971) have factor-analyzed the responses of 91 undergraduates to "stereotype checklists" of items concerning Jews and concerning atheists. Their results distinguished positive from negative stereotypes and (for perceptions of Jews) "contemporary" from "traditional" stereotypes.

Ehrlich (1973) has recently proposed a set of fourteen categories for classifying ethnic stereotypes. His scheme is based on a series of "trial and error content analyses" of a large number of words taken from the research literature on stereotypes. However, this classification is not based on empirical work concerning the ways in which specific ethnic images cluster.

In the light of the very scanty information which we now have on this subject, the primary purpose of this paper is to contribute to our knowledge about the basic dimensions of intergroup perceptions. Specifically, we present data concerning the factors underlying perceptions by black students and by white students of the other racial group.

An additional purpose of the paper is to provide data concerning the way in which each racial group sees the other race with respect to each of these perceptual dimensions. While there is, as indicated above, considerable evidence concerning the perceptions which people (including students) have of other-race individuals in general, there is little systematic evidence from school settings concerning the perceptions which students of one race have of their other-race schoolmates (for reviews of school integration literature, see Carithers, 1970; Hofmann, 1973). This paper contributes some detailed descriptive information about such student perceptions.

A final purpose of the paper is to make some assessment concerning the accuracy or inaccuracy of the various inter-racial perceptions. Some discussions of intergroup perceptions (often in

the context of "stereotypes") tend to assume that generalizations about intergroup differences are largely inaccurate;(e.g., Katz and Braly, 1935; Prothro and Melikian, 1954). Other writers have suggested that such generalizations may often have some validity (Vinacke, 1956; Mead, 1956). However, as Brigham points out, "in most cases, no criteria are available for assessing the factual validity of an ethnic generalization" (1971, p. 17). Only a few studies have attempted to compare the perceptions which one group has of another with objective data concerning the characteristics of various groups (La Piere, 1936; Schuman, 1966; Abate and Berrien, 1967). One of the purposes of this paper is to add to the limited evidence concerning the accuracy of various intergroup perceptions. Our data also have relevance to the suggestions made by some recent investigators (Triandis and Vassilou, 1967; Abate and Berrien, 1967 Schumann, 1966) about the circumstances under which inter-group perceptions may be relatively accurate or inaccurate.

The specific data we draw on have some distinctive features which are advantageous for the purposes just outlined. First, the measures of the inter-racial perceptions of each racial group are essentially identical, thus permitting a direct comparison of the underlying perceptual dimensions and of the concrete inter-racial perceptions of each racial group. Secondly, our data show how each racial group rates both the other race and its own race on identical perceptual measures, thus providing an own-race baseline against which to assess other-race perceptions. Third, unlike

much of the data in this area which represents judgments of small samples about ethnic or racial groups in general, these data were obtained from large samples in natural settings and concern perceptions about a specific group of people with whom the respondents are in contact. Finally, data obtained as part of our larger study permit us to assess, in part, the accuracy of certain interracial perceptions.

METHODS

Data Collection. The data to be presented are taken from a study of race relations in all of the public high schools in Indianapolis, Indiana. Data were collected during the 1970-71 school year at eleven school sites.[3] These school sites ranged from 1 percent black to 71 percent black in the composition of their student bodies, with the median black enrollment being 36 percent.

Early in the 1970-71 school year, informal interviews were conducted with black students and with white students in each school (matching the race of interviewer with that of respondent). In total, over one hundred such interviews with students were conducted. Among questions asked on a variety of subjects were questions bearing on the students' perceptions of other-race students in their school (e.g., what they are like, ways in which they are seen as similar to, or different from, students of one's own race). Data from these interviews helped us to formulate items for inclusion in a questionnaire concerning (among other things) perceptions of other-race (and own-race) schoolmates.

A two-part questionnaire was administered to a sample of students in the Spring of 1971. A sample of about 60 black students and 60 white students was selected systematically within each class of each school. Every nth student was selected from enrollment lists provided by the schools, with n varying according to the number of black students and of white students in each class. When there were fewer than 60 students of a given race in a given class, all of the students in that category were included in the sample.

Questionnaires were administered to students in group sessions in a large room at each school. Separate forms were given to black students and to white students (identified visually); these forms were essentially identical except that the terms "black" and "white" were transposed to fit the appropriate case. The questionnaires were administered by the investigators and their assistant(s)--usually comprising a bi-racial "team"--and students were assured that their answers would be completely confidential.

Of the total number of black students selected in the sample, 74.4 percent (N = 1,969) returned acceptably completed forms for Part II of the questionnaire (which contains most of the information relevant to this analysis). Among white students, 2,292 (80.9% of the total sample) acceptably completed Part II of the questionnaire.[4]

Perceptions of Other-Race Students. Our data on perceptions of other-race students are based on responses to the following question:

> "Listed below are a number of words that probably fit some people of every race. In your opinion, how many of the [other-race] students of your own sex in this school seem to fit each of the descriptions listed below?"

Twenty-six brief descriptive phrases were then listed. The list included descriptions such as: are fun to be with; are loud and noisy in school; want to get good grades; don't obey school rules; are smart in school; and talk and act in a crude or coarse way. The list of all descriptions used is found in Table 1.

For each of the descriptions, the students were asked to check one of six answers showing what proportion of other-race schoolmates fit this description: none; only a few; quite a few but less than half; about half; most; all or almost all.

Later in the questionnaire, an almost identical list of brief descriptions was repeated and this time the students were asked to check the proportion of (same-sex) students of their own race who fit each description. Thus, students' perceptions of other-race schoolmates can be compared to their perceptions of schoolmates of their own race.

To provide information about the structure of perceptions concerning other-race schoolmates, factor analyses were performed, separately for black students and for white students, on the twenty-six items concerning perceptions of the other race.[5] The method of factor analysis used was that of principal factoring, with an orthogonal equimax rotation.

Other Data. Among a large variety of data obtained for the overall study, several types of additional data obtained from the student questionnaires and from school records are relevant to the accuracy of inter-racial perceptions.

From student questionnaires, we obtained data concerning:

1) A variety of specific friendly contacts with other-race and with own-race schoolmates (e.g., doing school work together, visiting one another's homes)
2) A variety of specific unfriendly contacts with other-race and with own-race schoolmates (e.g., being called a bad name, getting into a fight)
3) Student aspirations for futher education
4) The importance to students of various goals (e.g., getting good grades)
5) Time spent on homework
6) Enrollment in one of four school programs (e.g., Academic, Vocational) or plans about type of courses to take. (Data on enrollment cross-checked against school records.)
7) Endorsement of conventional norms about school behavior (e.g., "pay attention in class even if things are boring for them".
8) Frequency of breaking a number of specific school rules (e.g., being late to class)
9) Frequency of thinking about a variety of subjects (e.g., of being hit or attacked by other-race students). These

questions were intended to be indicators of the intensity of concern which students had about various matters.

Data were obtained from chool records concerning:

1) Students' grade averages
2) Students' scores on standardized achievement tests. Students who were Juniors and Seniors at the time of our data-collection had taken the National Educational Development Tests. Students who were Freshmen and Sophomores at the time of our study took the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. Students took the achievement tests during their Sophomore years.

RESULTS

Dimensions of Perception

Black Perceptions. The factor analysis of the perceptions of white schoolmates by black students yielded six factors.[6] For black students the loadings of each perception item on each of the factors are shown in Table 1. Following is a list of these factors and the proportion of the total variance in Black perceptions which they explain. The names of the factors are ones which we have assigned to reflect the common content of those items which load highly on each factor. The highest-loading itmes are also given for each factor.

Factor 1: Unfriendliness to one's own race (Blacks), (19.7%). (1) act bossy with black students; 2) start fights with black students, and 3) are often mean to black students.

Factor 2: Academic Orientation (12.0%). (1) try real hard to do well in school; 2) want to get good grades, 3) are smart in school, 4) would like to go to college.

Factor 3: Unfriendlness to other-race (Whites), (7.8%). (1) act bossy with white students, 2) are often mean to white students, 3) start fights with white students.

Factor 4: Friendliness to one's own race (Blacks), (5.7%). (1) are willing to help black students; 2) are friendly to black students; 3) are fun to be with.

Factor 5: Norm-violations (5.1%). (1) are loud and noisy in school, 2) don't obey some school rules, 3) talk or act in a crude or coarse way, 4) expect special privileges for themselves in shcool, 5) act superior or 'stuck up'.

Factor 6: Toughness (4.2%). (1) are good fighters; 2) are afraid of black students, 3) are willing to help white students.

Together, these six factors account for 54 percent of the variance in judgments by black students of white students on the total set of perception items.

White Perceptions. A second factor analysis provides information concerning the perceptions by white students of their black schoolmates. This analysis resulted in five factors which met the usual criterion for further extraction

of factors. A sixth factor, which came close to meeting this criterion, was also extracted because of its theoretical interest and because it parallels a factor extracted for black students.[7] The results of this factor analysis are shown in Table 2.

One striking fact about the factors underlying White perceptions of Blacks is that they are essentially the same as those described above for Black perceptions of Whites. While there are a few minor differences between the races with respect to the items which load heavily on a given factor,[8] and some minor differences in the relative magnitudes of the loadings of items on a factor, the general pattern is of highly similar sets of items clustering together.

What is very different for the two racial groups is the relative salience or prominence of each of the factors, as reflected by the amount of variance explained by that factor. The order of salience of the factors underlying Black perceptions of Blacks by Whites, along with the proportion of total variance explained by each of the factors, follows:

Factor 1: Norm-violations (33.2%)

Factor 2: Unfriendliness toward the other race (Blacks)(10.8%)

Factor 3: Academic orientation (6.3%)

Factor 4: Friendliness to one's own race (Whites) (4.3%)

Factor 5: Unfriendliness to one's own race (Whites) (4.0%)

Factor 6: Toughness (3.4%)

Together, these six factors explain 62.0 percent of the variance in the perceptions of black schoolmates by white students.

A comparison of the order of importance of the six factors for each racial group shows that two dimensions (unfriendliness toward own race and norm violations) had markedly different salience for the two groups. Unfriendliness toward one's own race was much more salient for Blacks, while norm violations was a much more salient dimension for Whites. Academic orientation also appeared to be a somewhat more salient dimension for Blacks than for Whites. The three other perceptual dimensions (unfriendliness toward the other race, friendliness toward one's own race, and toughness) were about equal in salience for the two racial groups.

It is noteworthy that, for students of both races, friendly behavior and unfriendly behavior toward one's own race emerge as separate factors. It is interesting too, that for white students, those factors which reflect behavior by black students toward Whites personally (both friendly and unfriendly behavior) are much less salient than the norm-violations factor, which reflects behavior by black students which is generally observed by white students but in which white students ususally are not personally involved. However, the fact that one dimension is more salient than another in the perceptions by one race of the other race does mean necessarily that the first dimension is more strongly related to interracial behavior. We examine the relationships between interracial perceptions and interracial behavior in another paper (Patchen, Davidson, and Hofmann, 1974).

An additional finding of interest concerns the dimensions underlying perceptions by each race of schoolmates of their own race. As noted above, each student was asked a series of perceptual items concerning his own-race shoolmates which essentially paralleled the items concerning other-race schoolmates. Factor-analyses revealed that essentially the same factors underlying other-race perceptions also emerge with respect to same-race perceptions. (These data are not shown here.)

The Nature of Inter-racial Perceptions

While the factor analyses tell us something about the important factors underlying interracial perceptions, they do not tell us how the students of eahc race viewed other-race students with respect to each of these factors. Tables 3 and 4 show the responses of black students and of white students to those perception items which load most heavily (for the particular race) on each factor. Responses to identical items concerning perceptions of shcoolmates of the student's own race are also shown to serve as bases of comparison.

Black students. While the degree of unfriendly behavior by white students is the most salient factor in black perceptions, the data (Table 3) show only small differences in the unfriendly actions which black students attribute to white as compared to black schoolmates. White students are seen as being mean slightly more often but as starting fights with Blacks somewhat less often than do other Blacks.

With regard to items loading heavily on the second factor--academic orientation--the differences, again, were quite small. However, black students tend to see their white schoolmates as somewhat more academically oriented than students of their own race.

With regard to the third factor-unfriendliness toward white students--black students were more likely to see Blacks as being mean to white students than they were to see Whites being mean to other Whites. Black students also tended to see Blacks as acting bossy toward Whites and starting fights with Whites more often than Whites acted in these ways toward other Whites; however, these latter differences are slight.

With respect to items loading heavily on the fourth factor--friendliness toward black students--black students' perceptions of Whites differed markedly from their perceptions of other Blacks. Much smaller proportions of white students than of Blacks were seen by Blacks as "fun to be with" and substantially smaller proportions of Whites were seen as "willing to help black students". No comparative data are available with respect to the item "friendly to black students"--but less than one-fourth of the black students saw a majority of Whites in their school as being friendly to Blacks.

There also were noticeable differences with respect to items loading highly on the "norms violations" factor. The biggest difference in Blacks' perception of the two races is seen on the item "act superior or 'stuck up'." Blacks generally saw a higher

proportion of Whites than of Blacks acting in this way. Whites were also seen as somewhat more likely than Blacks to "expect special privileges for themselves in school" and slightly more likely to be those who "didn't obey school rules." Fellow Blacks were seen as slightly more "loud and noisy in school." Essentially no difference between the races was seen with respect to the item "talk and act in a crude or coarse way".

Finally, with respect to the "toughness" items, black students were much more likely to see high proportions of their own race as "good fighters" than they were to see Whites in this way. They also saw sizable proportions of white students as afraid of Black students. In contrast, black students were almost unanimous in seeing very few Blacks as afraid of Whites. With respect to the item "willing to help white students," which loads highly on the "toughness" factor, black students saw Whites as considerably more willing than Blacks to help Whites.[9]

White Students. Turning to the perceptions by white students (see Table 4), we may examine first the white students' responses to items loading on factor 1, "norms-violations". These data show that white students were much more likely to see black students than white students as norm-violators. Specifically, Whites perceived much larger proportions of black schoolmates as persons who a) talk and act in a crude or coarse way; b) are loud and noisy in school; c) don't obey some school rules; d) expect special privileges for themselves in school; and e) act superior or 'stuck up'.

With respect to perception items loading heavily on the second factor--unfriendliness toward black students--white students generally did not see large proportions of either race acting in unfriendly ways toward black students. However, they generally saw black students as somewhat more unfriendly toward other Blacks than they saw Whites as being. Whites perceived more Blacks as starting fights with Blacks and also more Blacks acting bossy with Blacks, as compared to the proportion of white students who acted in these ways. Also, Whites saw somewhat fewer Blacks than Whites as willing to help black students. On the other hand, Whites though that a somewhat larger proportion of Whites than of Blacks was "often mean to black students".

With respect to academic orientation (factor 3 for Whites), white students perceived their white schoolmates as being considerably more academically oriented than their black schoolmates. Specifically, Whites saw much larger proportions of Whites as persons who a) "try real hard to do well in school"; b) "want to get good grades"; c) "are smart in school"; and d) "would like to go to college".

With respect to items bearing on friendliness to Whites (factor 4), white students generally saw a much larger proportion of their own-race schoolmates than of black students as being friendly. Specifically, Whites saw other Whites as much more likely to be "willing to help white students" and "fun to be with". In response to a question concerning the proportion of

Blacks who are friendly to Whites, the modal responses were "quite a few" or "about half". A comparable question about the proportion of white students who are friendly to Whites was not asked.

Looking at responses to those items loading most heavily on factor 5, we may note that Whites tended to see black schoolmates as acting more unfriendly toward Whites than white schoolmates acted toward other Whites. White students tended to see a substantially larger proportion of Blacks than Whites as persons who: a) act bossy with white students; b) are often mean to white students; c) have a "chip on their shoulders" (too sensitive), and d) start fights with white students.

Finally, we may look at responses to those items which load heavily on "physical toughness" (factor 6). These data show that, in general, white students saw Blacks as somewhat tougher than Whites. Larger proportions of Blacks were seen as good fighters. Also, smaller proportions of Blacks than of Whites were seen as being "afraid of (other-race) students".

We may summarize and compare the way in which students of each race view each other by reviewing the perceptions of each with respect to each of the six perceptual factors.

1. Unfriendliness to one's own race. Blacks saw relatively little difference between the races with respect to overt unfriendliness toward Blacks. Whites saw Blacks as being more likely than other Whites to act in an unfriendly way toward Whites.

2. Friendliness toward one's own race. Students of both races saw considerably smaller proportions of other-race schoolmates than of same-race schoolmates as friendly to themselves.
3. Unfriendliness toward the other race. Black students generally saw unfriendliness toward Whites as coming more from Blacks than from Whites. However, white students generally saw unfriendliness toward Blacks as coming more often from black students than from Whites.
4. Norm-violations. Both races saw students of the other race as more likely to be norm-violators. However, white students saw larger differences between the races and differences with regard to a greater number of specific behaviors than did black students.
5. Academic orientations. Students of both races saw Whites as more academically oriented than Blacks. Blacks saw only slight differences in this regard while Whites saw substantial differences.
6. Toughness. Both black students and white students saw Blacks as physically tougher than Whites.

Accuracy of Perceptions

How accurate are the perceptions which students of each race have of schoolmates of the other race, as compared to those of their own race? While we cannot provide a complete answer to this

question, we do have some relevant data. The key relevant data are summarized in Table 5. [Additional, and more detailed, data on inter-racial interaction are presented elsewhere (Patchen and Davidson, with Hofmann and Brown, 1973)].

Unfriendliness. The first set of data concern the frequency with which students of each race reported having experienced unfriendly actions (being pushed or hit , being threatened, being called bad names) by students of the other race and by students of their own race. These data also indicate the frequency with which students of each race say that they "got so mad at [a schoolmate] that I pushed or hit that person first", both with regard to other-race and same-race schoolmates.

In general, these data are consistent with the perceptions of students of both races concerning overt unfriendliness by each race toward the other. The data indicate, first, that Whites are less likely to act in an overtly unfriendly way toward black students than are other Blacks. This pattern of results is consistent with overall White perceptions, and is also fairly consistent with Black perceptions. The data also indicate that, in general, black students are somewhat more likely to act in overtly unfriendly ways toward white students than are other white students. These results are consistent with the perceptions of both races concerning unfriendliness directed toward white students.

Friendly Behavior. Perceptions by both races that students of their own race are more friendly than students of the other

race also are consistent with limited relevant data concerning friendly interactions. Asked how often students of each race "did school work together with you" or "visited your home or had you over to their home", both Blacks and Whites were far more likely to report such friendly interactions with students of their own race than with other-race students. It should be noted, however, that the particular interactions mentioned usually require mutual friendliness, rather than merely friendliness from the other person.

Academic Orientation. Students of both races, and especially Whites, saw Whites as more academically oriented. The data shown in Table 5 indicate that some of the specific perceptions involved are accurate but others are not. Average grades and average scores on standardized achievement tests are considerably higher for white students than for black students in our sample.[10] Also, only 19% of black students in our sample were in the college preparatory (Academic) program or planning to take "academic type courses" as compared to 39% of the white students who were taking academic courses.

However, there is little evidence of difference in effort between the two racial groups. Approximately equal proportions of both groups reported spending one or more hours per day doing homework. On a composite measure of effort toward academic goals (which includes the "time on homework" item), Whites do score slightly higher than Blacks. But while this difference is

statistically significant for our large total sample, the difference is very small and is significant in only three of eleven schools; there is also one school where Blacks scored significantly higher than Whites on the effort measure.[11]

With respect to wanting to get good grades, a greater proportion of Blacks (74%) than of Whites (61%) said that this was "very important" to them. With respect to desire to go to college, there is little difference between the proportion of black students (48%) and the proportion of white students (46%) who said that they would like to go to a four year college or beyond. In general, then, the perception of Blacks as doing less well academically seems accurate but the perception of Blacks as caring less about academic success than Whites, or as trying less hard in school, seems much less accurate.

Norms-Violations. With respect to the kinds of behavior we have labelled "norms-violations", we have two kinds of relevant data: 1) the expressed norms of students and 2) students' self-reports about their own rule violations.

Students were asked "Do you feel that students should or should not, do each of the following things in school?" Items listed concerned beliefs about whether students should: a) "obey all school rules whether they agree with them or not"; b) "pay attention in class even if things are boring for them"; c) "have a little fun... even if it means being noisy at times"; d) "show respect for every teacher..."; e) "use swear words..." and f) "strike someone if that person does or says something bad to them".

For each item, the student checked one of three responses: a) "I think students should do that"; b)"It doesn't matter much to me whether they do that"; and c) "I think students should not do that". The results show only slight and inconsistent differences between Blacks and Whites with respect to all of these items except the one concerning hitting others when provoked. More Whites than Blacks (6?% to 49%) said that a student should not hit another in such circumstances. (This last item is also relevant to the unfriendliness dimension of perception.)

With regard to actual behavior, we do not have data on some of the kinds of behavior encompassed by perceptions of norm-violations. Thus, we do not have objective evidence concerning the extent to which students in these schools are loud and noisy, do things which might be called "crude and coarse", act superior or 'stuck up', or expect special privileges. We do, however, have reports from students of each race about how often they broke school rules--in particular being late for class, being absent, not getting all their homework done, missing a class without permission, and being told to come for a conference (a common disciplinary technique) "because you supposedly did something wrong."[13] The data (see Table 5) show that black students reported being late to class considerably more often than did white students (45% of the Blacks and 24% of the Whites said they were late once or twice a week or more often). With respect to

missing a class without permission, being called for a (disciplinary) conference, and being absent from school, differences between the races were fairly small (though statistically significant), with black students being slightly more likely to report each of these kinds of events. No difference was found between the races with respect to the frequency of not completing homework.

With respect to obeying school rules, then, there is some support for the accuracy of White perceptions of black students as violators of conventional norms. However, we do not know whether behavioral data (if available) would support racial differences with respect to other types of norms-violations, including those--expecting special privileges and acting "stuck-up"--which black students perceived Whites as committing most often.

Toughness. We do not have any objective data about how good students of each race are as fighters. However, we do know the responses of each student to a question concerning how often he thinks about the idea "that some (other-race) students might hit or attack me." White students (74%) were much more likely than black students (36%) to report thinking about this possibility at least "once in a while". Thus the perceptions of both races, that Whites are more afraid of other-race students than are Blacks, appears to reflect actual differences. Moreover, it should be noted that some of the evidence presented in the section on unfriendly behavior (Table 5)--e.g., the greater frequency

with which black students reported that they retaliated when hit and initiated fighting when angered--suggests that they have more confidence than Whites in their fighting ability and more success in such encounters.

DISCUSSION

Dimensions of Perception. In discussing the study results, first it is of interest to compare the factors of inter-racial perception which we found with the perceptual dimensions found in other studies. We may first compare our results with those of Osgood and his associates.

Osgood's work indicates that the primary dimension of cognitive meaning is evaluative. Four of the six factors found here are evaluative. But whereas the primary evaluative dimension is a single, unitary one in the work of the Osgood group, evaluations of the other race are of several kinds in our data. First evaluations of the interpersonal orientations of other-race students splits into a positive (friendly) factor and a negative (unfriendly) factor. Secondly, evaluations of interpersonal orientation are differentiated with respect to the target of the behavior; that is , behavior toward those of one race is distinguished from behavior toward the other race. Third, the evaluations reflected in the three "interpersonal" factors are independent of the evaluations of more impersonal, system-relevant orientations reflected on the "norms-violations" factor.

Osgood's second major dimension of meaning is that of potency. The "toughness" factor found in this study seems to reflect

physical potency. However the item "smart in school"--which might reasonably be thought to reflect another kind of potency--does not load on the same factor as those items bearing on physical toughness. Thus, if there is a potency factor emerging from this analysis, it is specific to a particular kind of activity--fighting.

The third basic factor emerging from the Osgood group's studies is that of activity. Our remaining factor--academic orientation--contains one item bearing on academic effort (activity), but also one dealing with smartness (a kind of potency) and several items dealing with academic aspirations, which reflect neither activity nor potency, at least directly. Thus, the academic orientation factor does not appear to correspond to any one of Osgood's three primary factors. Rather than seeing other-race schoolmates in terms of their general potency or general activity, students appear to see their schoolmates in terms of their overall excellence (potency, plus activity, plus interest) in a given field of endeavor. One might also interpret the toughness factor in this light--i.e., a perception of the overall excellence of the other race in the area of fighting.

We also may compare the perceptual dimensions found in this study with the dimensions of interpersonal perception found in the studies by Tupes and Christal and by Norman. There are no factors in our results to parallel their factors of extroversion

and of emotional stability. However, most of the factors which we did find seem to have some degree of parallel with the Tupes-Christal and Norman factors (the exception being the physical toughness factor). The friendliness factor and the two unfriendliness factors emerging from our data appear similar to the agreeableness factor of Tupes-Christal and Norman--with the important difference that our factors differentiate friendliness from unfriendliness and also differentiate among targets of unfriendliness. The academic orientation factor found in this study--on which items concerning trying hard and wanting to do well in school load highly--appears to overlap to some extent the conscientiousness factor found by Tupes-Christal and Norman. Also, the "norm-violations" factor in our study appears to have some overlap with the "culture" factor found by Tupes-Christal and Norman. For example, items like "crude and coarse" loaded highly on our norms-violations factor, while the scale "polished, refined--crude, boorish" loaded highly on the "culture" factor in the other studies.

Finally, we may compare our findings to those of Ehrlich and Van Tubergen (1971). While their results seem to indicate rather undifferentiated perceptions of Jews and atheists--i.e., as either positive or negative (with the negative image of Jews being split into "contemporary" and "traditional")--the perceptual structures of our respondents seem to be more complex (i.e., to have six dimensions). Some of the dimensions which we found do

fit into the more complex set of a priori categories which Ehrlich (1973) has proposed but others do not fit this scheme easily.[14]

Overall, these comparisons indicate that the dimensions of inter-racial perception found in this study have some similarities to the dimensions found in previous studies of interpersonal and intergroup perception. But they also indicate some differences among the sets of dimensions. These differences among studies may be due a) to differences in samples of raters; b) to whether people were rating individuals or groups and, if a group, the nature of the group; c) to the amount and type of interaction (if any) between raters and those judged; d) to differences in measures of perception; and e) to differences in methods of analyzing the data (especially, different variants of factor analysis). Because of such sources of variation, the perceptual dimensions found in the present study will not necessarily be the same list which will be found with respect to all intergroup perceptions in all settings. Certain of the dimensions we found (especially academic orientation and physical toughness) seem particularly relevant to high school settings, though parallel dimensions (e.g., work orientation) may well be found in other settings. Despite these qualifications, the results of the present study stand as the only available results (to our knowledge) about the dimensions of interracial perceptions specifically. The dimensions of interracial perception found in the present study appear to be meaningful and important. The items which

load on each of the six factors have a generally homogeneous content which makes them easily interpretable. The fact that essentially the same six factors emerge both for Blacks and for Whites--though in a different order of importance--indicates that these factors are generalizable across racial lines. Moreover, these dimensions of interracial perception are related to inter-racial behavior (Patchen, Davidson, and Hofmann, 1974). However, only further study can indicate the extent to which similar perceptual factors will be found in other studies of inter-racial and other intergroup relations.

Images of Other Race. With respect to the actual content of perceptions, we may note, first, that the perceptions of white schoolmates by black students were rather positive in some respects. On the perceptual dimensions which were most salient for black students (i.e., accounted for most variance in perceptions), Blacks saw Whites as no more unfriendly than Blacks, as slightly more academically oriented, and as more friendly to Whites. But while Blacks did not see Whites as overtly unfriendly, they also did not see them as positively friendly. Blacks also were inclined to see Whites as often acting superior and wanting preferred treatment. In general, the view of Whites by Blacks is consistent with that which lower-status minority groups often have been reported to hold of a higher-status majority group i.e., as one which is rejecting and discriminatory but which is also seen as having admirable, and perhaps superior,

traits which the minority aspires to emulate. (See for example, Bayton, 1941; Simpson and Yinger, 1972, p. 226-229).

Among white students, though perceptions of black schoolmates were fairly favorable in some respects, their perceptions of Blacks were more uniformly negative than their images of their own-race classmates. Although Whites credited Blacks with being physically tough, they tended to see Blacks as more loud and disruptive, as more unfriendly and aggressive, and as less ambitious and less successful in school. In general, this view of Blacks by Whites is consistent with that which higher-status dominant groups often have been reported to have of lower-status minority groups--i.e., as exhibiting behaviors which are not consistent with prevailing norms and social etiquette (see, for example, Gilbert, 1951; Secord, Bevan and Katz, 1956).

It is notable that the item "are from low income families" does not load highly on any of the perceptual factors underlying white students perceptions. Although traits such as aggressiveness and ambition may be class-linked, apparently most Whites saw them as specifically racial.

Accuracy of Perceptions. With regard to the accuracy of perceptions, we found that some student perceptions were not consistent with available evidence. In particular, white students' perceptions of relatively low academic aspirations among black students were not supported by the data. On the whole, however, the differences between the racial groups which were perceived

by students tended to be consistent with available data concerning objective group differences. Thus, consistent with the perceptions of one or both races, black students were more likely than white students to act in an overtly unfriendly manner toward other-race students; students of both races were more friendly with their own race schoolmates than with those of the other race; white students got higher grades and higher achievement scores than Blacks; black students reported violating some school rules somewhat more frequently than did Whites; and white students were more afraid of other-race schoolmates than were black students. These data do not show that students' inter-racial perceptions necessarily are accurate. Undoubtedly, many students exaggerated real differences between the races and/or overgeneralized differences and/or had perceptions which were rigid in the face of new experiences. These data do indicate that many--though not all--of the differences which students perceived had at least some basis in fact.

Several previous investigators (Triandis and Vassilou, 1967; Abate and Berrien, 1967) have suggested that perceptions of another ethnic or racial group are most likely to be relatively accurate when the perceivers have firsthand acquaintance with the group being judged. Most students in the present sample probably absorbed some racial images prior to high school, often from sources--e.g., family and the media--other than personal experience. But it is also true that the great majority of students in these schools had daily contact with other-race classmates, in classes, in hallways,

cafeteria, other settings.[16] Thus, while we have no direct evidence concerning the extent to which perceptions have been shaped by inter-racial experience, these results are consistent with the suggestions cited that perceptions will be relatively accurate when much inter-group contact occurs.

The present data also are generally consistent with Schuman's (1966) suggestion that perceptions of a given characteristic of a group are more likely to be accurate when that characteristic is observable than when it is not directly observable. The instances reported here in which perceptions appear most inaccurate--white perceptions that fewer black than white students want to get good grades and to go to college--concern impressions of non-observable, subjective states of schoolmates. On the other hand, those perceptions of group differences which appear to have some validity refer primarily to characteristics which are reasonably observable--e.g., unfriendliness, friendliness, breaking school rules, "smartness" in school.[17] While these data are consistent with the Schuman's suggestion that the observability of group characteristics affects the accuracy with which they are perceived, the data do not provide a direct, rigorous test of this hypothesis. Clearly, further work is needed to follow up these leads, as well as to investigate other conditions which may affect the accuracy of inter-group perceptions.

Table 1. Factor Loadings of Items* Concerning Perceptions of White Schoolmates of Same Sex (for Black Students)[a]

Item	Factor I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1. Fun to be with	-.05	.14	-.08	.63*	-.05	-.16
2. Two-faced or insincere with Black students	.23	.03	.20	-.31	.32	.27
3. Willing to help Black students	-.01	.16	-.02	.72*	-.09	-.08
4. Are willing to help White students	-.01	.18	-.20	.21	.14	.41*
5. Loud and noisy in school	.08	-.05	.15	.01	.58*	.05
6. Want to get good grades	-.05	.61*	-.07	.09	.07	-.05
7. Don't obey some rules	.04	.00	.16	.01	.54*	.12
8. Expect special privileges for themselves in school	.28	.02	.07	-.10	.46*	.24
9. Friendly to Black students	-.21	.27	-.09	.66*	-.02	-.05
10. Talk and act in crude or coarse way	.38	.03	.09	-.16	.53*	.08
11. Act superior or stuck up	.27	.14	.20	-.33	.44*	.26
12. Try real hard to do well in school	-.00	.64*	-.01	.11	.02	-.14
13. Often mean to Black students	.60*	.01	.22	-.23	.21	.10
14. Often mean to White students	.19	-.00	.61*	-.01	.12	-.17
15. "Chip on shoulder" (too sensitive)	.40	.06	.39	-.20	.31	.11
16. Would like to go to college	.03	.57*	-.01	.14	-.08	.20
17. Act bossy with Black students	.76*	.09	.12	-.14	.09	.04
18. Act bossy with White students	.17	.03	.67*	-.06	.18	.07
19. Try to please Black students	-.10	.17	.20	.39	-.01	.00
20. Start fights with Black students	.60*	-.11	.14	.08	.07	-.03
21. Start fights with White students	.19	-.03	.61*	.04	.14	-.02
22. Are smart in school	.00	.60*	.08	.19	-.04	-.03
23. Are good fighters	.06	.17	.19	.23	.03	-.45*
24. From low income families	.07	-.06	.29	.01	.26	-.02
25. Are afraid of Black students	.10	.04	.32	-.18	.17	.41*
26. Want to take part in school activities	.04	.49	-.01	.09	.03	.26
Percent of Variance Accounted for by Factor	19.7	12.0	7.8	5.7	5.1	4.2

*Starred items indicate those items which had the highest factor scores. Note that items are usually, but not always, those with the highest factor loadings.

[a]This factor analysis is based on an N of 1187 black students who answered all of the above perception items.

Table 2. Factor Loadings of Items* Concerning Perceptions of Black Schoolmates of Same Sex (for White Students) [a]

Item	Factor I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1. Fun to be with	-.19	-.04	.30	.51*	-.18	.21
2. Two-faced or insincere with White students	.37	.12	-.14	-.23	.36	-.12
3. Willing to help Black students	.11	-.20*	.04	.39*	.29*	.19
4. Willing to help White students	-.16	-.04	.30	.63*	-.21	.15
5. Are loud and noisy in school	.66*	.13	-.25	-.10	.25	-.00
6. Want to get good grades	-.13	-.09	.67*	.23	-.15	.18
7. Don't obey some school rules	.62*	.18	-.18	-.11	.28	-.01
8. Expect special privileges for themselves in school	.61*	.15	-.14	-.21	.31	-.11
9. Are friendly to White students	-.13	-.05	.35	.61*	-.25	.18
10. Talk and act in a crude or coarse way	.66*	.17	-.22	-.18	.32	-.07
11. Act superior or stuck up	.55*	.19	-.12	-.30	.37	-.13
12. Try hard to do well in school	-.14	-.05	.74*	.20	-.19	.14
13. Often mean to Black students	-.02	.52*	.08	-.04	-.02	-.06
14. Often mean to White students	.35	.27	-.12	-.26	.65*	-.19
15. "Chip on shoulder" (too sensitive)	.42	.22	-.19	-.21	.56*	-.14
16. Would like to go to college	-.12	-.01	.59*	.28	-.04	.17
17. Act bossy with Black students	.17	.59*	-.01	-.04	.19	-.08
18. Act bossy with White students	.38	.27	-.11	-.25	.67*	-.09
19. Try to please White students	-.17	.14	.36	.34	-.15	.03
20. Start fights with Black students	.10	.65*	-.06	.04	.13	-.01
21. Start fights with White students	.31	.30	-.09	-.23	.55*	-.09
22. Are smart in school	-.20	.03	.66*	.28	-.06	.21
23. Are good fighters	.14	.10	.08	.08	.25	.55*
24. Are from low income families	.24	.16	-.17	.02	.33	.06
25. Are afraid of White students	.06	.16	-.04	.00	.17	-.48*
26. Want to take part in school activities	-.11	.01	.43	.37	.01	.07
Percent of variance accounted for by factor	33.2	10.8	6.3	4.3	4.0	3.4

*Starred items indicate those items which had the highest factor scores. Note that these items are usually, but not always, those with the highest factor loadings.

[a]This factor analysis is based on an N of 1405 white students who answered all of the above perception items.

Table 3. Black Students' Perceptions of White Schoolmates As Compared to Their Perceptions of Black Schoolmates (Percentages)

Items with highest loadings on each factor	Black Students' Perceptions Of White Schoolmates: 'None' or 'only a few'	'Quite a few' but 'less than half'	'All' or almost all'	Of Black Schoolmates: 'None' or 'only a few'	'Quite a few' but 'less than half'	'All' or almost all'
I. Unfriendliness to Black students						
1. Act bossy with black students	62 %	24	14	64	30	7
2. Start fights with black students	80	15	4	70	26	5
3. Often mean to black students	65	26	9	73	24	3
II Academic Orientation						
1. Try real hard to do well in school	18	48	35	21	49	30
2. Want to get good grades	12	41	48	14	46	40
3. Are smart in school	22	62	16	25	60	15
4. Would like to go to college	17	48	35	25	49	26
III Unfriendliness to White students						
1. Act bossy with white students	54	33	13	46	39	16
2. Often mean to white students	69.	27	05	46	44	11
3. Start fights with white students	60	31	08.	52	37	11

Table 3 (continued)

Items with highest loadings on each factor	Black Students' Perceptions: Of White Schoolmates — 'None' or 'only a few'	'Quite a few' but 'less than half'	'All' or almost all'	Of Black Schoolmates — 'None' or 'only a few'	'Quite a few' but 'less than half'	'All' or almost all'
V. Friendliness to Black students						
1. Willing to help black students	55	33	12	25	37	38
2. Friendly to black students	35	42	23	--	--	--
3. Fun to be with	59	27	14	18	28	54
V. Norm-violations						
1. Loud and noisy in school	32	50	19	27	48	25
2. Don't obey some school rules	29	51	20	34	50	16
3. Talk and act in a crude way	48	38	13	49	39	12
4. Expect special privileges for themselves in school	38.	36	26	51	36	13
5. Act superior or stuck up	39.	34	27.	66	26	8
I. Toughness						
1. Good fighters	69	23	9.	20	37	44
2. Afraid of (other race) students	29	34.	37	87	10	3
3. Willing to help white students	27	31	43	51	40	9

*N equals about 1900 students. The exact N varies with each item, depending on the number of students who did not respond to that item.

Table 4. White Students' Perceptions of Black Schoolmates As Compared to Their Perceptions of White Schoolmates (Percentages)

Items with highest loadings on each factor	White Students' Perceptions Of Black Schoolmates: 'None' or 'only a few'	'Quite a few' but 'less than half'	'All' or almost all'	Of White Schoolmates: 'None' or 'only a few'	'Quite a few' but 'less than half'	'All' or almost all'
I. Norm-violations						
1. Talk and act in a crude or coarse way	29 %	40	31	58	38	04
2. Loud and noisy in school	14	38	48	42	51	07
3. Don't obey some school rules	23	46	31	41	51	09
4. Expect special privileges for themselves in school	33	36	32	60	33	07
5. Act superior or stuck up	42	34	24	53	41	06
II. Unfriendliness toward Black students						
1. Start fights with black students	69	27	5	84	14	02
2. Act bossy with black students	58	33	9	74	23	03
3. Often mean to black students	85	13	01	72	26	03
4. Willing to help black students	47	40	14	33	50	17
III. Academic Orientation						
1. Try real hard to do well in school	44	43	01	12	52	37
2. Want to get good grades	32	48	20	07	45	48

Table 4 (continued)

Items with highest loadings on each factor	White Students* Perceptions: Of Black Schoolmates: 'None' or 'only a few'	Of Black Schoolmates: 'Quite a bit' but 'less than half'	Of Black Schoolmates: 'All' or almost all'	Of White Schoolmates: 'None' or 'only a few'	Of White Schoolmates: 'Quite a bit' but 'less than half'	Of White Schoolmates: 'All' or almost all'
3. Smart in school	44	49	07	15	66	19
4. Would like to go to college	45	47	07	16	51	33
IV. Friendliness to Whites						
1. Willing to help white students	47	40	14	12	39	49
2. Friendly to white students	26	49	25	--	--	--
3. Fun to be with	49	32	19	10	31	59
V. Unfriendliness to Whites						
1. Act bossy with white students	34	40	26	65	31	03
2. Often mean to white students	39	44	17	73	26	01
3. Have "chip on their shoulders"	37	40	23	69	28	02
4. Start fights with white students	42	40	18	76	22	02
VI. Toughness						
1. Good fighters	21	41	38	33	53	14
2. Afraid of (other race) students	78	18	04	54	37	08

*N equals about 2200 students; the exact N varies with each item, depending on the number of students who did not respond to that item.

Table 5. Data Bearing on Accuracy of Interracial Perceptions*

	Blacks		Whites	
	Involving other race	Involving own race	Involving other race	Involving own race
A. Unfriendly Behavior (Student Reports) [a]				
1. "was called a bad name"	20	32	41	26
2. "threatened you in some way (percent saying 3 or more times)	7	--	24	--
3. "was pushed or hit...and pushed or hit back" (percent saying once or more)	35	41	31	36
4. "was pushed or hit...but decided not to push or hit back" (percent saying once or more)	20	--	40	--
5. "got so mad...that I pushed or hit that person first (percent saying once or more)	34	34	14	22
B. Friendly Behavior (Student Reports)				
1. did school work together with you (percent saying three or more times)	40	70	33	74
2. visited your home or had you over to their home (percent saying once or more)	38	91	32	93
C. Academic Orientation (School Records and Student Reports)				
1. Cumulative Grade Average (mean score)	3.6		4.5	
2. Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) (mean stanine scores)	3.4		4.9	
3. National Educational Development Tests (NEDT) (mean percentile scores)	32.6		56.8	
4. Percent in academic program or taking academic-type courses	19		39	
5. Percent saying they spend more than one hour per day on homework	39		42	
6. Percent saying "my getting good grades" is "very important"	74		61	
7. Percent saying they would like to go to a four-year college or beyond	48		46	
8. Net effort toward academic goals (index scores)[b]	.12		.16	

	Blacks	Whites
D. Violation of School Rules (Student Self-reports)		
1. Being late to class (once or twice a week or more)	45	24
2. Being absent from school (once or twice a week or more)	14	8
3. Not getting all your homework done (once or twice a week or more)	40	40
4. Being told to come for a conference because you supposedly did something wrong (once a month or more)	24	15
5. Missing a class without permission (once a month or more)	26	18
E. Physical Toughness (Student Self-reports)		
Percent who think about being hit or attacked by other race students at least "once a while"	36	74

*N = about 1900 for grades and for items involving reports by black students and about 2200 for grades and for reports involving reports by white students (N for each item varies slightly depending on number of non-responses to each item). N for MAT scores (taken only by lower two years in our sample) is 685 Blacks and 829 Whites. N for NEDT scores (taken only by upper two years) is 665 Blacks and 885 Whites.

All differences between Blacks and Whites shown on table are statistically significant at the .05 level or beyond, with the exception of items A3; B1 (involving own race); B2 (involving own race); C5, C7 and D3.

[a]Questions concerning unfriendly behavior, friendly behavior, and norm-violations were asked with respect to the current semester, which was nearly completed.

[b]See footnote 11 in text for description of this index.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The term "perceptions" is used here to encompass all kinds of inter-group images. Some of these images may be relatively accurate while other may be quite inaccurate. We will discuss the matter of accuracy later in this paper.

[2]They also found in some studies evidence for additional perceptual dimensions which, however, explained little of the overall variance in perceptual judgments.

[3]One essentially all-Black school, though covered in the study, is not relevant to the present analysis. White students at the school with only 1 percent Blacks and white students above the freshmen class in another school also are excluded from this analysis, since they had very few black students in their classes.

[4]Data concerning endorsement of conventional norms and concerning violations of school rules are taken from Part I of the questionnaire, which 75.1 percent of Black sample and 82.8 percent of White sample completed acceptably. Reasons why some students in the sample did not complete the questionnaire were absence, interfering school schedules, administrative mix-up in notifying students, or because their questionnaires were unusable. At least one "make-up" session for students who missed the initial questionnaire session was scheduled in almost every school.

[5]Since only students who answered all the twenty-six items were included in the factor analyses, the N for the factor analyses is reduced to 1187 for Blacks and 1405 for Whites.

[6]Six factors had associated eigenvalues of 1.0 or more, a commonly accepted criterion for extraction of factors (see Rummel, 1970:362-364.

[7]Rummel comments that an eigenvalue of 1.0 or more as a criterion for extracting factors should be used flexibly, depending on the particular analysis problems involved (Rummel, 1970:363-364).

[8]The identical set of items loads heavily, for both races, on the factors of norm-violations, academic orientation, unfriendliness to one's own race, and friendliness to one's own race. For the unfriendliness to their race factor, three items load heavily for both races; for whites, a fourth item, "'have a chip on their shoulders'", also loads heavily on this factor. For the physical toughness factor, two items load fairly heavily for both races; for Blacks, a third item, "are willing to help white students" also loads fairly heavily on this factor.

[9]This item concerning willingness to help other of the same racial group loaded fairly highly on the toughness factor for Blacks, though not for Whites. It may be that such willingness to be helpful was seen as being "soft".

[10] Further results concerning student academic performance and aspirations, as these relate to inter-racial contact and other factors, will be presented in a forthcoming report.

[11] The overall index of effort toward academic goals reflects an estimate of the total amount of time the student spent on homework during the semester minus the total time lost from academic work by cutting classes; being absent, being late, not completing homework, and doing things requiring disciplinary measures. It is based on the items from which data in sections C5 and D of Table 5 are taken. Because of the complex nature of the index computation, the scores are not directly interpretable.

[12] These items form part of the index of effort toward academic goals referred to above. We consider that these items are relevant both to effort and to rule-breaking. The academic effort index also includes other questions, especially concerning homework.

[13] The dimension "friendly to own race" seems to fit under Ehrlich's "positive relational qualities"; "friendly to own race" and "unfriendly to own race" might both fit Ehrlich's "conflict-hostility" except that they are separate dimensions; the other dimensions we found, while similar to some of Ehrlich's categories in certain respects, do not seem to fit them closely.

[14]Among white students, 54 percent said their "opinions of most Black people just before you came to this high school" was "good" or "pretty good"; 30 percent said it was "not too good" or "not good at all" and 16 percent said they "had no real opinion of them then". Comparable percentages for black students, with respect to Whites, were 42 percent (good), 28 percent (not good) and 30 percent (no opinion). With respect to change in opinion since coming to high school, 36 percent of white students said their opinions of Blacks had gotten better, 26 percent said their opinions had become worse, and 38 percent said they had stayed the same since coming to high school; comparable percentages among black students were 44, 41, and 16.

[15]Asked "In how many of your classes this semester do you have a seat or work place right next to one or more (other-race) students?", only 7 percent of all black students and 9 percent of all white students said 'none'.

[17]Students of both races are also accurate in their judgment of one subjective state--the relatively greater fear of other-race students by Whites. This perception is probably inferred in part from observables--e.g., from the under-spread perception among students of both races that black students are more able than white students to "push students of the other-race without the other-race fighting back."

REFERENCES

Abate, M. and Berrien, F.K.
1967 "Validation of Stereotypes: Japanese versus American Students. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 7:435-438.

Bayton, J.A., McAlister, L.B. and Hamer, J.
1956 "Race-Class Stereotypes." Journal of Negro Education 25:75-78.

Brigham, J.
1971 "Ethnic Stereotypes." Psychological Bulletin 76: 15-38.

Brink, W. and Harris, L.
1966 Black and White. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Campbell, A. and Schuman, H.
1968 Racial Attitudes in Fifteen American Cities, Supplemental Studies for the National Advisory Commission. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center (June).

Carithers, M.W.
1970 "School Desegregation and Racial Cleavage, 1954-1970: A Review of the Literature." The Journal of Social Issues 26 (4):25-48.

Cothran, T.C.
1951 "Negro Conceptions of White People". American Journal of Sociology, LVI:458-467.

Ehrich, H. and Van Tubergen, G.N.
1971 "Exploring the Structure and Salience of Stereotypes." Journal of Social Psychology 83:113-127.

Ehrlich, J.
1973 The Social Psychology of Prejudice. New York: John Wiley.

Gilbert, G.M.
1951 "Stereotype Persistence and Change Among College Students." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46:245-254.

Hofmann, G.
1973 Inter-racial Fraternization: Social Determinants of Friendship Relations Between Black and White Adolescents. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Purdue University.

Johnson, R.
1957 Negro Reactions to Minority Status, in Milton C. Barron (ed.), American Minorities, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Karlins, M., Coffman, T.L. and Walters, G.
1969 "On the Fading of Social Stereotypes: Studies in Three Generations of College Students." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 13:1-16.

Katz, D. and Braly, K.
1933 Racial Stereotypes in One Hundred College Students. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 28:280-290.

La Piere, R.T.
1936 Type-rationalization of Group Antipathy. Social Forces 15:232-237.

Mead, M.
1956 The Cross-cultural Approach to the Study of Personality, in J.L. McCary (ed.), Psychology of Personality. New York: Grove Press.

Norman, W.T.
1963 "Toward an Adequate Taxonomy of Personality Attributes: Replicated Factor Structure in Peer Nomination Personality Ratings." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 66:574-583.

Osgood, C.E.
1971 "Exploration in Semantic Space: A Personal Diary." Journal of Social Issues 27:5-64.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G. and Tannenbaum, P.
1957 The Measurement of Meaning. Campaigne: University of Illinois Press.

Passini, F.T. and Norman, W.T.
1966 "A Universal Conception of Personality Structure." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 4:44-49.

Patchen, M., Davidson, J.D. and Hofmann, G.
1974 The Relationship of Inter-racial Perceptions and Emotions to Inter-racial Behavior in High Schools. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Patchen, M. and Davidson, J.D., in collaboration with Hofmann, G., with assistance of Brown, W.
1973 Patterns and Determinants of Inter-racial Interaction in the Indianapolis Public High Schools. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Prothro, E.T. and Melikian, L.H.
1955 Studies in Stereotypes: V. Familiarity and the Kernel of Truth Hypothesis. Journal of Social Psychology 41: 3-10.

Rummel, R.J.
1970 Applied Factor Analysis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Schuman, H.
1966 Social Change and the Validity of Regional Stereotypes in East Pakistan. Sociometry 29:428-440.

Todd, F.J. and Rappoport, L.
1964 A Cognitive Structure Approach to Person Perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 68:469-478.

Triandis, H.C. and Vassilou, V.
1967 Frequency of Contact and Stereotyping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 7:316-328.

Tupes, E.C. and Christal, R.E.
1958 Stability of Personality Trait Rating Factors Obtained Under Diverse Conditions. USAF Technical Note, No. 58-61.

Vanden Zander, J.W.
1972 American Minority Relations (3rd edition). New York: Ronald Press.

Vinacke, W.E.
1956 Explorations in the Dynamic Process of Stereotyping. Journal of Social Psychology 43:105-132.

Works, E.
1961 The Prejudice-Interaction Hypothesis from the Point of View of the Negro Minority Group. American Journal of Sociology 67:47-52.